



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/203,965	12/02/1998	GENE W. LEE	DAVOX-159XX	4873

28452 7590 08/12/2003
BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 HANOVER STREET
SUITE 303
MANCHESTER, NH 03104

EXAMINER

DEANE JR, WILLIAM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/203,965

Applicant(s)

LEE, GENE W.

Examiner

William J Deane

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-15 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-15 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 2, 4 – 7, 9 – 15 and 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,278,898 (Cambray et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,572 (Friedes et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,173,052 (Brady)

With respect to claims 7 and 15, Cambray et al teach a hold queue prioritizing system, comprising; an automatic telephone system (Col. 1, lines 43 - 44), a call receiver/director (12), a customer database (Col. 2, line 57), a means for obtaining identifying information (note call ID and indicia of Fig 1), at least one hold queue (18) connected to call receiver/director (12) (see Fig. 1), a plurality of call agent terminals (16) coupled to the automated phone system (Fig. 1) and a hold queue prioritizer/call retriever (26).

Therefore, Cambray et al. teach the claimed device except for a means responsive to obtained caller identifying information, for searching a customer database to identify customer data records corresponding to the caller identifying information for each of said plurality of connected calls, and retrieving a call prioritizing information from each of the customer databases. In addition, Cambray et al. does not teach displaying a list of call records and identifying information in a call queue, and thereby allowing an agent to manually select a call from the call list.

First, Friedes et al. teach such limitations (see Col. 4, lines 15 – 29 and Col. 11, lines 38 – 43). Note that the prioritizing is the fact that the caller is a gold cardholder and therefore entitled to different call treatment. In addition, note the use of ANI for identifying the customer database. It would have been obvious to have incorporated such limitations as taught by Friedes et al. into the Cambray et al. device as such would only entail the substitution of one indicia for another or the addition of a well known indicia.

Second, Brady teaches displaying a list of call records and identifying information in a call queue, and thereby allowing an agent to manually select a call from the call list. See Abstract, Col. 1, line 55 – Col. 2, line 60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have incorporated such a means for displaying a list of call records and identifying information in a call queue, and thereby allowing an agent to manually select a call from the call list, as taught by Brady into the Cambray et al./Friedes et al. device in order to make the call center more efficient.

With respect to claims 9 and 18, note raw customer information retrieved (note Col. 3, lines 8 – 11 of Cambray et al.).

With respect to claim 10, note call priority score (Claim 2)

With respect to claims 11 and 19, note absolute priority (FIFO, Col. 2, lines 11 - 16).

With respect to claim 12, note Col. 2, lines 5 - 8 and Col. 5, lines 15 - 31.

With respect to claim 13, Cambray et al does not teach ANI but does teach Call ID. Note the use of ANI as discussed above by Friedes et al. It would have been

Art Unit: 2642

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such use of ANI as taught by Friedes et al. into the Cambray et al. device as such would only entail the substitution of one well known identification means for another.

With respect to claim 14, note Col. 2, line 60.

With respect to claim 17, note Col. 2, line 65 - Col. 3, line 4.


With respect to claims 1 – 6, such method claims would be inherent from the discussion above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 2, 4 – 7, 9 – 15 and 17 – 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (703) 306-5838. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (703) 872-9314.

29Jul03


WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER